<div align="center">**REMARKS**</div>

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June 29, 2007. Upon consideration of this response, claims 82 – 105 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   **Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings***

     A.   **Claim 82 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings***

The Office Action indicates that claim 82 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 82. More specifically, claim 82 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data different than the first data, said second data comprising a ***channel table*** that includes a plurality of assigned channel categories to television channels, wherein the channel table includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein ***at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***; and
> a processor, coupled to the memory, the processor configured to simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table for data related to at least one channel to which a category is assigned and causing the display of at least one television program, the processor further configured to receive selection of a channel category and, in response to receiving selection of the channel category, provide program information associated with the at least one channel to which the selected channel category is assigned.
> **(*emphasis added*)**

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 82 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Lasky* nor *Collings* discloses, teaches, or suggests in "a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising… a memory configured for storing a first data and a second data… said second data comprising a ***channel table*** that includes a plurality of assigned channel categories to television channels, wherein the channel table includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein ***at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 82. More specifically, *Lasky* discloses a "Program Guide Database 52" (see FIG. 5) that may be configured to store "a record for each program, and each record has information for its program in fields" (column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that a database that includes a record for each program (and thus has multiple records for multiple respective programs) is different than a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***. For at least this reason, claim 82 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, nowhere else does *Lasky* disclose a "channel table" of any kind. The Office Action appears to associate the channel hat 62 to the channel table recited in claim 82. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. More specifically, the channel hat 62, as illustrated in FIG. 6B of *Lasky* merely provides a single title 623, category 624, channel number 132 and indicators of other programs 621, 622. For at least the reason that *Lasky* fails to disclose a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, Applicants respectfully submit claim 82 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, the Office Action attempts to associate FIG. 6C of *Lasky* with claim 82. However, FIG. 6C "lists other variables that control program 51 maintains to support sideways surfing in TV mode" (column 6, line 66). Applicants respectfully submit that a listing of variables to support sideways surfing is different than a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***. For at least this additional reason, claim 82 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Collings* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Collings* discloses a "BITS field (2 bits) containing a number representing the number of bits in the category" (column 25, line 13). Applicants respectfully submit that, as illustrated in these passages, *Collings* fails to disclose "a memory configured for storing a first data and a second data… said second data comprising a ***channel table*** that includes a plurality of assigned channel categories to television channels, wherein the channel table includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein ***at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 82. Applicants respectfully submit that representing the number of bits in a category is different than the cited passages of claim 82. For at least this reason, claim 82 is allowable over the cited art.

B.   Claim 95 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings*

The Office Action indicates that claim 95 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 95. More specifically, claim 95 recites:

In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:

an interface to the television network, said interface configured for receiving a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data comprising a **channel table**, wherein the channel table includes a **listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields**, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein **at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**; and

a processor, configured to simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table for data related to at least one channel to which a category is assigned and display at least one television program, the processor further configured to receive selection of a channel category and, in response to receiving selection of the channel category, provide program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected category is assigned.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 95 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Lasky* nor *Collings* discloses, teaches, or suggests in "a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising... an interface to the television network, said interface configured for receiving a first data and a second data... said second data comprising a **channel table**, wherein the channel table includes a **listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields**, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein **at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 95. More specifically, *Lasky* discloses a "Program Guide Database 52" (see FIG. 5) that may be configured to store "a record for each program, and each record has information for its program in fields" (column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that a database that includes a record for each program (and thus has multiple records for multiple respective programs) is different than a channel table that

includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***. For at least this reason, claim 95 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, nowhere else does *Lasky* disclose a "channel table" of any kind. The Office Action appears to associate the channel hat 62 to the channel table recited in claim 95. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. More specifically, the channel hat 62, as illustrated in FIG. 6B of *Lasky* merely provides a single title 623, category 624, channel number 132 and indicators of other programs 621, 622. For at least the reason that *Lasky* fails to disclose a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, Applicants respectfully submit claim 95 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, the Office Action attempts to associate FIG. 6C of *Lasky* with claim 95. However, FIG. 6C "lists other variables that control program 51 maintains to support sideways surfing in TV mode" (column 6, line 66). Applicants respectfully submit that a listing of variables to support sideways surfing is different than a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***. For at least this additional reason, claim 95 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Collings* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Collings* discloses a "BITS field (2 bits) containing a number representing the number of bits in the category" (column 25, line 13). Applicants respectfully submit that, as illustrated in these passages, *Collings* fails to disclose "an interface to the television network, said interface configured for receiving a first data and a second data… said second data comprising a ***channel table***, wherein the channel table includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein ***at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 95. Applicants

respectfully submit that representing the number of bits in a category is different than the cited passages of claim 95. For at least this reason, claim 95 is allowable over the cited art.

C. Claim 98 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings*

The Office Action indicates that claim 98 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 98. More specifically, claim 98 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a ***channel table*** that includes respective associations of one or more channel categories for a plurality of corresponding television channels, wherein the channel table includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein ***at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***; and
> a processor, coupled to the memory, for causing the display of a browse banner on top of a portion of a first television program being displayed responsive to receiving an initial activation of a browse command, said browse banner comprising first program information, said first program information corresponding to a second television program different than the first television program, wherein the processor causes the display of said browse banner on top of the first television program without providing the second television program, the processor further configured for simultaneously searching at least a portion of the channel table for data related to at least one channel to which a category is assigned and causing display at least one television program, said processor further configured to receive a selection of a channel category and, in response to receiving selection of the channel category, provide program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected category is assigned.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 98 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Lasky* nor *Collings* discloses, teaches, or suggests in "a television network,

a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising… a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a **channel table** that includes respective associations of one or more channel categories for a plurality of corresponding television channels, wherein the channel table includes a **listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields**, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein **at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 98. More specifically, *Lasky* discloses a "Program Guide Database 52" (see FIG. 5) that may be configured to store "a record for each program, and each record has information for its program in fields" (column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that a database that includes a record for each program (and thus has multiple records for multiple respective programs) is different than a channel table that includes a **listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields**. For at least this reason, claim 98 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, nowhere else does *Lasky* disclose a "channel table" of any kind. The Office Action appears to associate the channel hat 62 to the channel table recited in claim 98. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. More specifically, the channel hat 62, as illustrated in FIG. 6B of *Lasky* merely provides a single title 623, category 624, channel number 132 and indicators of other programs 621, 622. For at least the reason that *Lasky* fails to disclose a channel table that includes a **listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields**, Applicants respectfully submit claim 98 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, the Office Action attempts to associate FIG. 6C of *Lasky* with claim 98. However, FIG. 6C "lists other variables that control program 51 maintains to support sideways surfing in TV mode" (column 6, line 66). Applicants respectfully submit that a listing of

16

variables to support sideways surfing is different than a channel table that includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*. For at least this additional reason, claim 98 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Collings* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Collings* discloses a "BITS field (2 bits) containing a number representing the number of bits in the category" (column 25, line 13). Applicants respectfully submit that, as illustrated in these passages, *Collings* fails to disclose "a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a *channel table* that includes respective associations of one or more channel categories for a plurality of corresponding television channels, wherein the channel table includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein *at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels*" as recited in claim 98. Applicants respectfully submit that representing the number of bits in a category is different than the cited passages of claim 98. For at least this reason, claim 98 is allowable over the cited art.

D.   Claim 100 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings*

The Office Action indicates that claim 100 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 100. More specifically, claim 100 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:

a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a **_channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories_**, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein the channel table includes **_a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields_**, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, **_wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels_**; and

a processor coupled to the memory, said processor configured to:

receive a user-selected television channel category, and

responsive to the receiving the user-selected television channel category, search at least a portion of the channel table and provide program information exclusively for television programs corresponding to television channels associated with the user-selected television channel category,

wherein the processor is configured for simultaneously searching at least a portion of the channel table and causing the display of at least one television program.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 100 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Lasky* nor *Collings* discloses, teaches, or suggests in "a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising… a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a **_channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories_**, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein the channel table includes **_a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields_**, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, **_wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels_**" as recited in claim 100. More specifically, *Lasky* discloses a "Program Guide Database 52" (see FIG. 5) that may be configured to store "a record for each program, and each record has information for its program in fields" (column 5, line 64). Applicants

respectfully submit that a database that includes a record for each program (and thus has multiple records for multiple respective programs) is different than a channel table that includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*. For at least this reason, claim 100 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, nowhere else does *Lasky* disclose a "channel table" of any kind. The Office Action appears to associate the channel hat 62 to the channel table recited in claim 100. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. More specifically, the channel hat 62, as illustrated in FIG. 6B of *Lasky* merely provides a single title 623, category 624, channel number 132 and indicators of other programs 621, 622. For at least the reason that *Lasky* fails to disclose a channel table that includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*, Applicants respectfully submit claim 100 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, the Office Action attempts to associate FIG. 6C of *Lasky* with claim 100. However, FIG. 6C "lists other variables that control program 51 maintains to support sideways surfing in TV mode" (column 6, line 66). Applicants respectfully submit that a listing of variables to support sideways surfing is different than a channel table that includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*. For at least this additional reason, claim 100 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Collings* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Collings* discloses a "BITS field (2 bits) containing a number representing the number of bits in the category" (column 25, line 13). Applicants respectfully submit that, as illustrated in these passages, *Collings* fails to disclose "a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a *channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories*, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein the channel table includes *a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of*

respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, **wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 100. Applicants respectfully submit that representing the number of bits in a category is different than the cited passages of claim 100. For at least this reason, claim 100 is allowable over the cited art.

      E.   <u>Claim 104 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings*</u>

The Office Action indicates that claim 104 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 104. More specifically, claim 104 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a **channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories**, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, **wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**; and
> a processor, coupled to the memory, said processor configured to simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table and cause display of at least one television program, the processor further configured to receive selection of a channel category and provide program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected channel category is assigned.
> **(emphasis added)**

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 104 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Lasky* nor *Collings* discloses, teaches, or suggests in "a television

network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising… a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a ***channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories***, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, ***wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels***" as recited in claim 104. More specifically, *Lasky* discloses a "Program Guide Database 52" (see FIG. 5) that may be configured to store "a record for each program, and each record has information for its program in fields" (column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that a database that includes a record for each program (and thus has multiple records for multiple respective programs) is different than a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***. For at least this reason, claim 104 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, nowhere else does *Lasky* disclose a "channel table" of any kind. The Office Action appears to associate the channel hat 62 to the channel table recited in claim 104. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. More specifically, the channel hat 62, as illustrated in FIG. 6B of *Lasky* merely provides a single title 623, category 624, channel number 132 and indicators of other programs 621, 622. For at least the reason that *Lasky* fails to disclose a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***, Applicants respectfully submit claim 104 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, the Office Action attempts to associate FIG. 6C of *Lasky* with claim 104. However, FIG. 6C "lists other variables that control program 51 maintains to support sideways

surfing in TV mode" (column 6, line 66). Applicants respectfully submit that a listing of variables to support sideways surfing is different than a channel table that includes a **listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields**. For at least this additional reason, claim 104 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Collings* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Collings* discloses a "BITS field (2 bits) containing a number representing the number of bits in the category" (column 25, line 13). Applicants respectfully submit that, as illustrated in these passages, *Collings* fails to disclose "a memory configured for storing respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs and a **channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of television channel categories**, each television channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, wherein the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, **wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels**" as recited in claim 104. Applicants respectfully submit that representing the number of bits in a category is different than the cited passages of claim 104. For at least this reason, claim 104 is allowable over the cited art.

   F.   **Claims 83 – 92, 94, and 97 are Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings***

   The Office Action indicates that claims 83 – 92, 94, and 97 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 83 – 92, 94, and 97. More specifically, dependent claims 83 – 92 and 94 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable

independent claim 82. Dependent claim 97 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable independent claim 95. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

II.   **Claim 93 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings* further in view of *Amano***

The Office Action indicates that claim 93 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,585,865 ("*Amano*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of *Collings* further in view of *Amano* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 93. More specifically, dependent claim 93 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 82. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

III.   Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings* further in view of *Yuen*

      A.   Claim 102 is Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of *Collings* further in view of *Yuen*

The Office Action indicates that claim 102 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of U.S. Patent

Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,673,089 ("*Yuen*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view of

Collings further in view of *Yuen* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim

102. More specifically, claim 102 recites:

> In a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising:
> an interface for receiving data from the television network, said interface being capable of receiving a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data comprising *a channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of channel categories, each channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, said plurality of categories including a first category*; and
> processor configured to:
> receive a first user input corresponding to the assignment of the first channel category to a first television channel,
> responsive to the receiving the first user input, store the association of the first channel category and the first television channel in the memory,
> receive a second user input corresponding to the first channel category,
> responsive to the receiving the second user input, simultaneously search at least a portion of the channel table and cause the display of at least one television program,
> receive third user input corresponding to selection of a channel category, and
> responsive to receiving the third user input, providing program information associated with at least one channel to which the selected channel category is assigned,
> wherein the channel table includes a listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields, the plurality of respective bit fields including a plurality of bits with a plurality of respective values, wherein at least one of the bits refers to a predetermined category and wherein the respective values indicate at least one category assigned to the respective channels.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 102 is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that neither *Lasky* nor *Collings* discloses, teaches, or suggests in "a television network, a terminal for providing television program information and television programs, said terminal comprising… an interface for receiving data from the television network, said interface being capable of receiving a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data comprising *a channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of channel categories, each channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, said plurality of categories including a first category*" as recited in claim 102. More specifically, *Lasky* discloses a "Program Guide Database 52" (see FIG. 5) that may be configured to store "a record for each program, and each record has information for its program in fields" (column 5, line 64). Applicants respectfully submit that a database that includes a record for each program (and thus has multiple records for multiple respective programs) is different than a channel table that includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*. For at least this reason, claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, nowhere else does *Lasky* disclose a "channel table" of any kind. The Office Action appears to associate the channel hat 62 to the channel table recited in claim 102. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. More specifically, the channel hat 62, as illustrated in FIG. 6B of *Lasky* merely provides a single title 623, category 624, channel number 132 and indicators of other programs 621, 622. For at least the reason that *Lasky* fails to disclose a channel table that includes a *listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields*, Applicants respectfully submit claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, the Office Action attempts to associate FIG. 6C of *Lasky* with claim 102. However, FIG. 6C "lists other variables that control program 51 maintains to support sideways surfing in TV mode" (column 6, line 66). Applicants respectfully submit that a listing of variables to support sideways surfing is different than a channel table that includes a ***listing of a plurality of channels and a plurality of respective bit fields***. For at least this additional reason, claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

Further, *Collings* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky*. More specifically, *Collings* discloses a "BITS field (2 bits) containing a number representing the number of bits in the category" (column 25, line 13). Applicants respectfully submit that, as illustrated in these passages, *Collings* fails to disclose "an interface for receiving data from the television network, said interface being capable of receiving a first data and a second data, said first data including respective program information for a plurality of corresponding television programs, said second data comprising ***a channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of channel categories, each channel category being associated with a corresponding plurality of television channels, said plurality of categories including a first category***" as recited in claim 102. Applicants respectfully submit that representing the number of bits in a category is different than the cited passages of claim 102. For at least this reason, claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

Additionally, *Yuen* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Lasky* and *Collings*. More specifically, *Yuen* discloses a "plurality of theme keys, each theme key corresponding to one theme of a plurality of themes" (column 3, line 62). Applicants respectfully submit that a plurality of theme keys is different than "***a channel table that includes a bit field signifying a plurality of channel categories***," as recited in claim 102. For at least this additional reason, claim 102 is allowable over the cited art.

B. <u>**Claims 96, 99, 101, 103, and 105 are Allowable Over *Lasky* in view of**</u>
<u>***Collings* further in view of *Yuen***</u>

The Office Action indicates that claims 96, 99, 101, 103, and 105 stand rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,367,078 ("*Lasky*") in view of

U.S. Patent Number 5,828,402 ("*Collings*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,673,089

("*Yuen*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Lasky* in view

of *Collings* further in view of *Yuen* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of

claims 96, 99, 101, 103, and 105. More specifically, dependent claim 96 is believed to be

allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 95.

Dependent claim 99 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that it depends from

allowable independent claim 98. Dependent claim 101 is believed to be allowable for at least

the reason that it depends from allowable independent claim 100. Dependent claim 103 is

believed to be allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable independent

claim 102. Further, dependent claim 105 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that

it depends from allowable independent claim 105. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v.*

Chemque, Inc., 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

_____
/afb/
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
 HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500